

REMARKS

After entry of the foregoing Amendment, Claims 6 - 8, and 53 are pending in the present Application. Claims 1-5, 9, 10, 15-52 have been withdrawn. Claims 6-8, and 53 have been amended. Support for the amendment of Claims 6-8, and 53 can be found at least on page 108 of the specification and Figs. 38 and 39. No new matter has been added.

By way of summary, the Official Action presents the following issues: Claims 6-8 and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Tatebayashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,028,937, hereinafter Tatebayashi '937) in view of Tatebayashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,034,618, hereinafter Tatebayashi '618)

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed September 6, 2005. Applicants note that this IDS has yet to be indicated as considered by the Examiner. As such, Applicants respectfully requests that the Examiner provide an initialed Form 1449 in the next communication.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Official Action has rejected Claims 6-8 and 53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Tatebayashi '937 in view of Tatebayashi '618. The Official Action contends that Tatebayashi '937 discloses all of the Applicants claim limitations with the exception of the provision of a key category. The Official Action cites Tatebayashi '618 as disclosing this more detailed aspect of the Applicants' invention, and states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine the cited references for arriving at the Applicants' claims. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Amended Claim 6 recites, *inter alia*, an information processing apparatus, including:

... receiving means for receiving a key category, a random number, and a device ID from said another information processing apparatus; ...

key creation means for establishing a common key shared with said another information processing apparatus based on the key category and device ID.

Tatebayashi '937 describes a system in which authentication is performed between a verifier device and a claimant device. The verifier (101) and the claimant (104) communicate via an AV bus (107).¹ As shown more specifically in Fig. 6, tables are prepared in which authentication protocols are listed relative to processing speeds of a verifier and claimant device. In this way, an authentication protocol can be selected in accordance with the optimum combination of processing speed and authentication relative to a verifier and claimant device.

Tatabayashi '618 is a related application to Tatabayashi '937 and describes a device authentication system.² During authentication, a function selection number (i) is recovered from an optical disc (60) by the optical disc drive apparatus (70). The claimant function number (i) is utilized to identify a claimant function $f_i()$ for calculating a function value, which is utilized in a challenge procedure as CHA1.

Conversely, Applicants invention is directed toward a reciprocal authentication processing in which a common key is shared between two devices in accordance with a key source category. As shown more specifically in Figs. 38 and 39 of Applicants' specification, a portable device (6) negotiates with a second device via a reciprocal authentication processing in which a key category number (G), a random number and device ID are utilized to generate a transient key (Ks).³ In this manner, a more secure authentication processing is

¹ Tatebayashi at Fig. 1; column 8, lines 15-20.

² Tatabayashi '618 at Fig. 9.

³ Application at pages 108-110.

configured to prevent unauthorized copying. Neither Tatabayashi '937, nor Tatabayashi '618, disclose or suggest reciprocal authentication including receiving a key category number, a random number and a device ID from another information processing apparatus for generating a common key.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 6-8 and 53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Consequently, in view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present Application, including Claims 6-8 and 53, is patently distinguished over the prior art, in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Scott A. McKeown
Registration No. 42,866

BDL:SAM:ycs

I:\ATTY\SAM\PROSECUTION WORK\204478\AMDT DUE 29FEB06.DOC